

Message

From: Sivak, Michael [Sivak.Michael@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/13/2019 11:43:22 AM
To: Vaughn, Stephanie [Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]; Donovan, Betsy [Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: RKL 3/11 CAG MTG - Highlights

Yep. I'm happy to continue attending these – just let me know if you need me. Also, I suggest asking Rachel to attend. It might be helpful to have her there to answer questions as the expert, and she also might learn more about how CAGs work. Just a thought.

Michael Sivak

sivak.michael@epa.gov
212.637.4310

From: Vaughn, Stephanie
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 10:36 AM
To: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>
Cc: Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>; Clemetson, Michael <Clemetson.Michael@epa.gov>; Seppi, Pat <Seppi.Pat@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RKL 3/11 CAG MTG - Highlights

I think we can use this as a bridge to the full FS presentation. In other words, even if we're not ready to present the alternatives at the next meeting, we can present the early parts of the FS...which is basically another presentation of the RI data highlighting those areas that drive the risks, and discussing that our alternatives will need to address risks.

Hope this makes sense....

From: Sivak, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 10:28 AM
To: Donovan, Betsy <Donovan.Betsy@epa.gov>; Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>; Clemetson, Michael <Clemetson.Michael@epa.gov>; Seppi, Pat <Seppi.Pat@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: RKL 3/11 CAG MTG - Highlights

Great summary, Betsy.

I think the CAG understood the risks – both HH and eco – aren't great, and are primarily focused on PCBs and metals. It might be helpful when discussing the RI again, to focus on pointing out the areas with elevated PCBs and metals that would likely be targeted in the RA.

Michael Sivak

sivak.michael@epa.gov
212.637.4310

From: Donovan, Betsy

Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 10:07 AM

To: Vaughn, Stephanie <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov>

Cc: Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; Fajardo, Juan <Fajardo.Juan@epa.gov>; Clemetson, Michael <Clemetson.Michael@epa.gov>; Seppi, Pat <Seppi.Pat@epa.gov>

Subject: RKL 3/11 CAG MTG - Highlights

FWS presentation – they pretty much stuck to their slides. They got some questions about construction details for landfill capping and engineering controls, which Matt politely postponed until we get into the FS stage. Actually one of the CAG members asked a really good question – he wanted to know the size of Asbestos Dump OU3 and the Harding Landfill caps compared to Rolling Knolls. ADOU3 is 7 acres (~12-15 before consolidation) and Harding is 1 acre (~2 before consolidation). Rolling Knolls Landfill is 170 acres.

BHHRA presentation – Michael did a fine job. He started off by making a distinction between trash and hazardous waste and also pointed out that the FWS presentation seemed out of sequence since the risk assessments had not been presented yet and we have a step-wise process in Superfund. He got a question about dioxins: where did they come from & why no risk? he explained why they did not trigger risk. Another question about lead from Julia, she said it seemed to be out there as an add on, so he explained why lead is evaluated separately. CAG wants to see maps with lead – I pointed out that the RI Appendix C has maps for seven predominant contaminants, including lead, and we will provide them. One CAG member wanted to see the list of COCs and Michael showed her the table – he brought the report.

BERA presentation – Dan did a fine job as well. Not too many questions.

FS – I said we are still working on revisions and need NJDEP comments, and we estimate that we will release the FS in early summer.

Climate Change – One CAG member asked if we consider climate change when selecting the remedial alternatives. Michael said we have nine evaluation criteria in CERCLA and that it could be incorporated under long term effectiveness and permanence criteria.

Residential Standard – One CAG member asked if that would require more cleanup. She also asked if EPA ever cleans up sites to remove all contamination in NJ. I said yes and referred to the residential cleanups in Montclair and Glen Ridge.

Land Use – How do we ensure that the land use will remain the same? Juan explained that the Wilderness Act would take an act of Congress to change and that there are wetlands and other existing restrictions on other parts of the site that would prevent development, however if the land use did change the remedy would have to be revisited to be protective.

Wildlife Standards – Sally asked if there are cleanup standards for wildlife. We said there are no promulgated standards. We responded that all remedies must meet the threshold criteria of protecting human health and the environment.

Next –

- PRPs presentation: Sally offered PRPs a chance to present at a future CAG meeting
- RI: CAG wants more detailed RI presentation, since the Dec. meeting was only one hour and it was rushed.
- SF 101 is still on the radar for the next meeting.